

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON**

MARVIN RANDALL,

Petitioner,

v.

ERIN REYES,

Respondent.

Case No. 2:23-cv-01826-SB

**ORDER ADOPTING JUDGE
BECKERMAN’S FINDINGS AND
RECOMMENDATION**

IMMERGUT, District Judge.

No objections have been filed to Judge Beckerman’s Findings and Recommendation (“F&R”), ECF 40. For the following reasons, the Court ADOPTS Judge Beckerman’s F&R.

STANDARDS

Under the Federal Magistrates Act (“Act”), as amended, the court may “accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). If a party objects to a magistrate judge’s F&R, “the court shall make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made.” *Id.* But the court is not required to review, de novo or under any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the F&R that are not

objected to. *See Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149–50 (1985); *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003) (en banc). Nevertheless, the Act “does not preclude further review by the district judge, *sua sponte*” whether de novo or under another standard. *Thomas*, 474 U.S. at 154.

CONCLUSION

No objections were filed in response to Judge Beckerman’s F&R. Nonetheless, this Court has reviewed the F&R de novo. The F&R, ECF 40, is adopted in full. This Court DENIES Petitioner’s Amended Motion for Preliminary Injunction, ECF 30.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this 15th day of August, 2024.

/s/ Karin J. Immergut
Karin J. Immergut
United States District Judge